DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 577 HE 007 316

AUTHOR Berdahl, Robert O.
TITLE The State of State Planning, Coordination and Governance. Issues in Higher Education. No. 9.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS College Role; Coordination; Directories; *Educational Accountability; Educational Development; Evaluation; *Governance; Government Role; *Higher Education; Policy Formation; *State Boards of Education; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *1202 Commissions

ABSTRACT

The role and powers of the statewide boards of education have come under scrutiny and attack. This document examines the problems in the area of planning and program review, institutional closure and evaluation of the whole public policy-making process. Issues discussed are how: (1) a "self-denying ordinance" had governed higher education; (2) the affluence of the 1960's has yielded to the austerity of the 1970's; (3) "instant coordination" conflicts with constituent participation; (4) a bit of loose money can have a disproportionate effect; and (5) anticipating program phase-outs can avoid "ad hockery." (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119577

The State of State Planning, Coordination and Governance

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by Robert O. Berdahl, Senior Fellow
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education

The role and powers of the statewide boards have come under scrutiny and occasionally under attack. Sometimes there have been proposals to strengthen the boards. Other times governors' vetoes have been invoked, either to hold the power of a board or to alter its role in one way or another.

I'm not going to discuss the budgetary aspect of the process of statewide boards in a comprehensive fashion primarily because Dr. Lyman A. Glenny, who directs the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California in Berkeley, has a major national study on state budgeting for higher education in the offing. Since comprehensive analysis of the budget area is forthcoming from Dr. Glenny, I have chosen problems in the area of planning and program review, institutional closure and evaluation of the whole public policy-making process as the things on which I'd like to concentrate.

Part of the pleasure of my research has been interviewing people both in state capitals and on the campuses. It's been both amusing and a little painful to hear people tell you candidly what they think of "the other side"—what some of the stereotypes are that make harmonious relationships more difficult. Some academics tend to picture most politicians as venal individuals who care not for principle at all. Conversely, people in the state capital tend to talk about the ivory tower, academic fuddy-duddies who are purists and don't know how the political process really works. Yet the reality is grossly different.

I think it was Woodrow Wilson who remarked that he found both the state house in New Jersey and the White House in the District of Columbia relatively simple going after suffering the rigors of the presidency at Princeton University. Politics in Academe can be very, very tough and very, very vicious, and on some occasions even very exasperating. I think it was Robert Gordon Sproull, president of the University of California before the days of Hitch and Kerr, who was known to remark, in the days when such sexist statements could escape uncriticized, that the only place on campus where the faculty could decide what it wanted to do was in the men's room. This kind of idea that the faculty is incapable of coming to any kind of crunch or decision-making is not unknown around the country.

And yet in my own travels I've found that the faculty can be politically astute if they are brought in and matters are explained in a way other than just in terms of narrow self-interest. On the other hand, I've also certainly found that officials in the governors' offices and in the state legislatures have a great deal of knowledge and genuine concern about higher education. For example, I've had some previous contact with SREB Board member Senator D. Robert Graham of Miami Lakes, Florida. He has one of the essays in a volume that I edited on evaluating statewide boards. And I found that quite a few legislators share his kind of interest in higher education. Therefore, we are not talking about discrete, watertight compartments, with the world of politics *here*, and the world of higher education *there*.

Sorting Out the Appropriate Roles

The real problems obviously arise in where we get the meeting and meshing of those two obviously somewhat distinct worlds. And in state after state, it is clear that there are troubled waters. Some of the legislatures are evidently feeling that the institutions or statewide boards have not been making the kinds of decisions or

HE 002 316

A "self-denying ordinance" has governed higher education.

policies that the legislature feels is in the public interest, and they've begun to move into domains that previously were excluded from the political process. By the same token there are people in universities and colleges that are sure that autonomy is a thing of the past and that the state bureaucracy will move in. One hears an unending series of complaints about central purchasing, central personnel control, and line item budgets with rigid control over transfer from one category to another. Let's face it: there are troubled areas on the agenda which need candid assessment.

Historically, the states have treated higher education extremely well. This has been the best of both possible worlds in that the states have given generous support while really following something that the Carnegie Council is thinking of calling "a self-denying ordinance." This is a relationship in which higher education has been treated with certain special considerations: Twenty-three states, for example, give some form of constitutional recognition to higher education; whereas few other state departments other than constitutional offices are so recognized. Forty states confer corporate power on their higher educational boards; few other state boards have this.

Elections or appointments of board members are for a longer period than for most public offices, and it is often specified that selection of board members must be on a non-political basis. Many boards have been given direct borrowing power, which is rarely given to state divisions. Many are given power to appoint treasurers and to select their own depositories and disburse funds, especially institutional funds, directly—a condition again very rare in other state agencies. Many other higher education state boards are given wide discretion, and in many circumstances complete autonomy, on policy matters such as admission requirements, graduation requirements, programs, courses and degrees to be offered. Almost all states leave to the higher education boards full authority over all matters relating to academic and professional personnel. Most states require more or less complete personnel reporting in connection with the budget, but leave final determination to the boards after the appropriation is made. Few boards are given complete authority over administrative and clerical personnel other than the highest administrative positions.

Now the point is that historically the role of the lay board of trustees was to reassure the state government that the institution was being governed with appropriate sensitivity to the public interest. Through time, however, that pattern began to run into difficulties. The institutions proliferated with the addition of the land-grant institutions, with the movement of some of the teacher training institutions from normal schools to teachers colleges toward eventual state universities and with the entry onto the scene of the community colleges. The variety of lay boards of trustees—each proposing that their own institution or institutions get bigger and better and take on new programs and new students—began to overwhelm the state legislatures and governors with a variety of requests that they could no longer just respond to in an ad hoc manner. They had to be brought together, looked at in some relative context and then some judgments had to be made about priorities.

Where Is Ultimate Authority Lodged?

Now, the major changes that occurred in this historical pattern of the self-denying ordinance were several. On the one hand, there was the emergence of the executive budget, which was an attempt to bring not only all higher education budgets but all state government budgets into one coherent package where the state priorities could be laid out and higher education integrated into those state priorities. On the other hand, the lay board tended to have its role altered in one way or other. Either a coordinating board was brought in to try to bring some coherence to the many requests that were coming out of the separate institutional boards, or in some other states, the separate boards were eliminated and consolidated into one central board.

In either case, that 19th century principle of the institutional board acting in lieu of any other state agency to certify that the institution was being run in

Dr. Berdahl offered this summary of statewide planning, coordination and governance during a colloquium on meeting the state's responsibilities in higher education, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Education Board in Boca Raton, Florida, June 15-17, 1975.

The affluence of the 60's has yielded to the austerity of the 70's.

the public interest has had to yield to these various other arrangements. There are many areas of confusion as to where the boundaries are between the state and the educational governing elements, whether it be at the institutional level, at a multi-campus level or at the statewide consolidated board level.

Meanwhile, in the state government offices there is additional confusion as to where real authority is lodged: whether it be the governor's office with its finance staff or planning staff or the legislature, which now usually has committees in both houses. In some cases, according to the upcoming Glenny study there are both majority and minority staffs for each legislative committee. The result is that the institutional officers have to explain themselves not just once or twice but maybe four or five times. Therefore, the problems are multiplying. It will do us well to try to stand back and take stock of where the boundaries are in this shifting scene.

One of the major problems in this new context is the new style of planning which will be necessary. In contrasting today with the Sixties, we look back with a bit of nostalgia now and see them as the "good ole days." Growth was the name of the game, then. There was sufficient affluence so that the state budgets for higher education went up year after year after year. If planning mistakes were made (and occasionally with the best will in the world things were put in the wrong place or put there prematurely) with the passage of a few years, these mistakes tended to be buried by growth, and they weren't that visible or that embarrassing eight or ten years later. In terms of enlarging the planning family there were in most states efforts to bring in the community colleges in a way that prior to the Sixties not many states had done. Either community colleges were created from scratch, if a community college system wasn't in existence, or if these two-year institutions were operating out of a "K-14" administration of a state board of education, they might be brought over to the statewide board for higher education. (In some states, of course, they were not and they continue to be in a separate jurisdiction.) Later in the Sixties and early Seventies, some states also began to move, however tentatively, to include higher education in their long-range planning.

To sum up in terms of the planning problems of the Sixties, it was that linkage of planning for growth in a context of relative affluence with only marginal enlargement of the planning family that was experienced. So, the planning problems were there, they were massive, and they tended to be quantitative. But, they were the kinds of planning problems I imagine a person enjoys handling. In contrast to that, looking ahead, it's a less happy picture. We know that the enrollment growth is already slowing down and that in the 1980's it will absolutely stop unless new types of students appear in remarkable numbers, which for the moment we can't be sure about. We know that the affluence of the Sixties has yielded to the austerity of the Seventies and that the relative priority of higher education in terms of state funding has slipped pretty badly.

Enlarging the Planning Family

Furthermore, we now know that the enlargement of the planning family is not just a marginal enlargement to the community colleges and the private sector, but a change in kind rather than in degree, as we now try to reach out and incorporate the institutions that offer vocational education, technical education, proprietary education—in fact all the resources in the community including, for example, those relevant to adult learning and off-campus learning. Some of the bolder plans around the country speak of bringing in things like museums, art galleries, and theatres: in other words, recognizing that education goes on in industry, trade unions, government and prisons, to name but a few. These bold new visions sound better in theory than so far has been realized in practice. Many state plans call for planning to reach out and incorporate many of these elements that traditionally just have not been part of our agenda.

Frankly, all this raises some very serious difficulties in terms of the planning process. For example, we know that in areas such as federal manpower training there is a Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) (with a tidy $5.4 billion price tag to go with it) which mandates prime sponsors and a state manpower planning council. Somehow the planning process will have to link up traditional higher education not only with private higher education, vocational-technical, and proprietary education, but also state manpower planning. This is an awesome task indeed, and I hope that those of you on the state government side will be a little patient if the early results are on the rather thin side because it's going to require a readjustment of a planning style that by the late Sixties had just begun to come together with some coherence for the conditions then prevailing.

"Instant coordination" conflicts with constituent participation.

The data problems are obviously also enormous. Groups like NCHEMS (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems) in Boulder Colorado, and the National Center for Educational Statistics were just beginning to get some data categories of what is meant by full-time student or program or faculty, which with some difficulty were being applied to all traditional higher education institutions. While there were complaints from research universities that they could not be in the same data boat as the community colleges, those problems were at least within reach of being minimally resolved. But now when we try to include proprietaries and vo-tech, the old definitions and categories just don't fit. So in terms of data, we've got real problems.

1202 Commissions and Planning

In terms of the planning process, the question is what will be the forum where these disparate groups come together. One forum that's been suggested are the nationally-funded state 1202 Commissions coming out of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. There the amount of federal funds available has been very modest. The states that created 1202 Commissions the first time around got something on the order of $26,105 each. On the second time, it's been slightly more, prorated on size, but I think the maximum amount will still be $100,000.

I have noticed in 1202 Commissions in the South a variety of different patterns have been chosen. Some took existing boards, some augmented existing boards and some created new commissions. Similarly, in terms of the invitation in the 1202 package to consolidate some of the existing state-administered federal programs in higher education, Titles I, VI, and VII of the Higher Education Act of 1963, some states chose to consolidate them all, some chose to join two of the three and some put together none of them. Therefore, in terms of the planning process, we have enormous fragmentation and variety, and I don't think anybody is quite sure of who's on first or what's on second. Part of our problem now in the planning process is that if we do make mistakes with an unnecessary medical school or an unnecessary doctoral program in Russian studies or a brand new campus in response to the understandable efforts of a local Chamber of Commerce to boost its area, these mistakes are not going to be buried by the future. In fact, they're going to stand out glaringly by the 1980's, when one of the problems on the statewide public policy making agenda may be which institution shall be closed.

Another difficulty is that there may be a tug of war between the need for participation by the constituent elements in planning and the need for some output with speed. I mean if some governors and legislators can be accused of wanting "instant coordination" or a "bigger bang for a buck in a hurry," on the other hand, they have a right to say that the planning process cannot go on forever. Yet the state boards that are engaged in the planning must realize that unless they bring along the constituent elements with them, the kind of short cut planning that puts flashy results in the window will then meet a thousand and one different ingenious ways in which hostile institutions can veto by acts of omission and commission the implementation of plans with which they disagree. Therefore, as the planning family gets bigger and more disparate, the problem of involving those new elements is going to be a major problem for the participatory side of planning.

What Are the Institutional Territories?

Still another problem will be that differentiation of function for the various institutions will have to be reexamined and reapplied against the context of the broader family. Most role and scope missions were assigned in the Sixties when it seemed relatively clear who was going to do what. A university would do this kind of thing, the state colleges or regionals would do this, the community colleges would do that.

Now, of course, there are the additional dimensions of the private sector and the voc-tech and proprietary elements. I'm told that the problem in the Sixties tended to be that often times there was the upward mobility syndrome where some two-year colleges wanted to become four-year and some four- and five-year colleges wanted to become universities and that basically the differentiation of function was a kind of a process of sitting on the lid. Now Clark Kerr told me that after a recent visit to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges he heard complaints from within its ranks that in the frantic search for hot bodies to generate the full-time-equivalent (FTE) student count to keep the budgets coming in, the four-year institutions have begun to poach on two-year territory. All of a sudden those adult education programs looked awfully good because there was "gold in them thar hills" that hadn't been fully mined by the community colleges and

A bit of loose money can have a disproportionate effect.

there has been some kind of reverse envy and some territorial poaching there.

Another example of a problem is this differentiation of function is that occasionally private institutions are taken into the public sector and one has to find out what their role will be alongside the existing public institutions that may have a somewhat parallel function. Another problem will be that as the federal role has receded somewhat—it clearly hasn't backed out but it's diminished relative to the intensity of the Fifties and particularly the Sixties—how will the research-oriented state university that tends to specialize in graduate and professional programs and research get along in the context of state planning?

The state planners may not be as sympathetic to the claims, sometimes justified and sometimes perhaps not, that that kind of state university with that kind of orientation is serving not only state needs but regional needs, national needs and indeed in some excellent departments, international needs. So there is going to be a bit of a tug-of-war there in any kind of reassessment between the state university saying, "Well we know we owe the state something and should be sensitive to state needs, but by the same token we ask you to be sensitive to the fact that we're serving regional, national and international constituencies as well." Sometimes these institutions recruit student body and faculty from all over the country and occasionally from abroad. So an unresolved problem of the late Seventies and early Eighties will be to make peace somehow between state priorities and needs and the research university mission that is by definition somewhat broader.

Another problem will come in the area of whether it will be possible to plan and fund and coordinate off-campus programs in the traditional manner. A legislative committee in one state found that, having agreed to get some state appropriations into an area that traditionally in many states has been required to be self-financing, all of a sudden some institutions just loved that slot machine—they were coming and pulling that handle as fast as they could. So that's another example of the new kinds of problems that I see emerging: namely, how will the state plan and coordinate and fund the new kinds of broader mission that we all think ought to occur?

I have heard about a proposal in Florida to create a whole set of regional consortia that link up some of the traditional elements with nontraditional, trying to put some funds through them in order to identify the new markets and identify the potential resources to meet those new markets. Now regionalism and consortia concepts are spreading around the country but with very mixed results. A candid assessment as of now would be that with very few exceptions the state mandated programs in regionalism are more talk than delivery. That does not mean that they may not have a potential that needs exploiting, but when it comes down from the top and without the accompaniment of substantial funds—the carrot as well as the stick—it just hasn't resulted yet in significant change.

Budgeting Can Encourage Innovation

Clearly another area of concern is whether state budgeting either inhibits or encourages some of the innovations that need to occur. There is a new study out from the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington on government funding policies for nontraditional programs. This is a modest survey of the way in which some of the traditional formulas of student credit hours and FTE enrollments are multiplied times so many dollars to generate the budget. The survey indicates that this procedure, in fact, tends to inhibit some of the nontraditional developments and innovations like the part-time student, the evening student, the adult learner, the off-campus learner, and special kinds of freshmen and sophomore courses where the faculty-student ratio just cannot be as lean as it would be in the normal faculty formula. There are a whole variety of experiments—Empire State in New York, University Without Walls and Minnesota's Metropolitan College—which run into funding problems since they have to fit into the traditional funding pattern and some of the definitions that I earlier described which have begun to emerge for traditional higher education, just really don't fit this area very well.

By the same token the Institute for Educational Leadership is also looking at the other side of the coin—the extent to which some states may be creating incentive grants to encourage innovation. Now I know, having talked to a lot of legislators and some governors, that there is an understandable reluctance to leave much loose money lying around; they don't have a lot of confidence that the people who might get their hands on it would necessarily spend it to the best effect. And yet I would point out that in the time of fiscal austerity a little bit of loose money can probably have a disproportionate effect in bringing on altered behavior. When

Agencies Responsible for Coordination of Higher Education in the SREB States

[This list includes, for each state, (1) the state agency responsible for the coordination of collegiate institutions, including agencies responsible for community college systems where this function is separate and (2) the postsecondary education (1202) commission (*), in states where such a commission has been established.]

Alabama
Executive Director
Alabama Post-Secondary 1202 Commission
Room 483
State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Executive Director
Alabama Commission on Higher Education
1504 Union Bank Building
60 Commerce Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Arkansas
Director
Department of Higher Education*
401 National Old Line Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Florida
Director
State Planning Council for Post-High School Education
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Chancellor
State University System of Florida
107 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Director
Division of Community Colleges
Department of Education
523 Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Georgia
Executive Director
Georgia Postsecondary Education Commission
Suite 620
2970 Peachtree Road, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30305

Chancellor
University System of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Kentucky
Kentucky Commission for Postsecondary Education
(In process of being organized)
Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Executive Director
Council on Public Higher Education
809 Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Louisiana
Executive Director
Louisiana Board of Regents*
P.O. Box 44362-Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Maryland
Director
Maryland Council for Higher Education*
93 Main Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Mississippi
Executive Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Board
P.O. Box 4300
Jackson, Mississippi 39216

Executive Secretary and Director
Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning
P.O. Box 2336
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Director
Division of Junior Colleges
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

North Carolina
President
University of North Carolina
P.O. Box 2688
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

North Carolina
State President
Department of Community Colleges
State Board of Education
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

South Carolina
Executive Director
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education*
Room 406, Rutledge Office Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Tennessee
Executive Director
Tennessee Higher Education Commission*
908 Andrew Jackson State Office Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Texas
Executive Secretary
Governor's Advisory Committee on Postsecondary Educational Planning
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Austin, Texas 78711

Commissioner Coordinating Board, Texas
College and University System
P.O. Box 12788—Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Virginia
Director
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia*
Tenth Floor, Life of Virginia Building
914 Capitol Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

West Virginia
Chancellor
West Virginia Board of Regents*
1316 Charleston National Plaza
Charleston, West Virginia 23501

*Serves as postsecondary education (1202) commission.

things are tight a bit of green can be a great incentive.

I'm a card-carrying faculty member and I know how quickly our heavily engrained, resistant behavior can respond to that kind of lure. It means we can be bought easily, to put it bluntly. In the Sixties when the money was flowing from a variety of sources, one would have had to wave a red flag and hire a 10-piece band to attract our attention. In the late Seventies and Eighties this conservatism and resistance may become somewhat less formidable in the face of some loose money which is put into some kind of kitty (with a statewide board or multi-campus governing unit or elsewhere) and then awarded on a competitive basis in terms of the best ideas that come forward in the area under consideration. The monies might be for academic innovation, they might be for faculty development or improved teaching, they might be for interinstitutional cooperation through consortia, or they might be for improved management procedures like encouraging the use of consultants. There are a variety of uses to which they could be put.

Anticipating program phase-outs can avoid "ad hockery."

Devising a Rationale for Institutional Closure

Next let me turn to the area of program discontinuance and institutional closure. Ideally one would get the kinds of changes that we think will be needed to change from higher education to postsecondary education through a combination of good planning, good data, good participation, reassessment of the differentiation of function and perhaps through the use of regionalism and consortia and of state incentive grants. But let's face it, that may not be enough in some areas and in some states. What we know is that some programs now have failed to attract enough students to really make them defensible in academic or economic terms. Now to their credit, some institutions in some state systems have already recognized this and have begun to move in on the problem. I would just urge that one of the issues of the late Seventies and early Eighties will be to anticipate this before it really gets serious because if it's done under crisis conditions, the procedures will be abrasive, the reactions will be hostile and, even if ultimately some programs are discontinued, the bruised feelings and hostilities may be very destructive.

Therefore, while we have time now, I would urge the need to give careful advance thinking about the procedures, the criteria and the definitions that might be invoked. Clearly most statewide boards now engage in review of new programs. If some are stopped before they come, it's less painful: the faculty hasn't been hired and hasn't been given tenure, the students haven't been recruited and aren't living in the dorms on the campus, the library facilities and labs haven't been built. But if it's an existing program, then clearly it's a much, much more sensitive process. And I would say then that the state public policy makers in question, whether they be the governor's office, the legislative committees or the statewide board, need to be very sensitive to the fact that they must bring in the institutions early in the process, try to educate them to the need to cooperate, give them every right to be heard and to participate in creating the guidelines under which the process will proceed. Several states—perhaps 8 or 10 out of 50—have now embarked on this process in one form or another, not without some controversy, I might add.

If selective discontinuance is not an adequate answer to the problem of enrollment decline, there is the more drastic option at the end of that line called institutional closure. Now heaven forbid that it be necessary on a very wide basis, but we do know in the 1930's some institutions had to be closed, we do know that in the past 10 years some private institutions have closed or merged and the enrollment projections indicate that it's not an impossible possibility in the years ahead. Once again it would be wise for the state governments to anticipate the problems and to try to create careful processes for thinking about it ahead of time. In fact in Wisconsin, Governor Patrick Lucey did ask the University of Wisconsin System to come back in a few months with a plan for the orderly phase-down and phase-out of institutions in the system. The university response which came in mid-April listed an order in which phase-out could occur but urged the governor to reconsider by saying that significant savings would not result unless the people that were attending the closed institutions were denied access to some other element in the university system. And they said really let's face it, what you're talking about is abandoning the traditional Wisconsin practice of broad access to higher education. Now if you want to do that as a conscious act of public policy we will live with it and we will do the following things, but we don't think you should do it with any illusion that it can be business as usual or that we are going to save a lot of money without denying access to significant numbers of people. There were some problems with that Wisconsin report that I don't have time to go into but at least it's significant that it was an effort by the public sector to consider openly and candidly what might be the process by which some of it would be closed down.

Similarly, in the private sector state actions have become relevant in a way that maybe 10 or 15 years ago they were not. In Florida, of course, New College has been absorbed into the public system. In Alabama there was a proposal to take Athens College into the public system, and the statewide board came out with a report that said there was plenty of unused room in public institutions nearby. The State Board of Public Education indicated that it was willing to absorb it into its system, but I haven't heard the past month since I was in Birmingham how the issue has been resolved. Clearly, the issue of the private sector vis-a-vis state action is very much on the agenda. In New York State several of the private colleges are in deep trouble; in fact, one which threatened to close down was into debt to the state dormitory authority for so many state bonds that the state government felt it had to bail it out in order not to lose all that state money. That's a little bit of an extreme case, but it might be a clue to private college presidents that if you get into debt deep enough to the state, they can't let you sink.

In order to try to avoid that kind of "ad hockery," New York has created a Regents Advisory Commission on the Financial Problems of Postsecondary Institutions headed by Nathan M. Pusey, president emeritus of Harvard University, to try to think in advance about the conditions under which state intervention to save an institution, whether private or public, would be justified in the public interest, and when, in contrast, the state should stay out and let the institution reach its own natural fate. It is also supposed to recommend procedures to ease the trauma attendant with closure—the shock to the faculty, the shock to the students and the shock to the community in losing that form of smokeless industry. So the New York commission then will try to conceptualize what Steve Bailey has called "*triage*"—a French word meaning you sort out the wounded into those who are savable with modest help, those who are so far gone that you have to put them out of misery, and those that require extensive medical intervention. Now it may be that states around the country might do well to copy the New York example or Governor Lucey's example and try to think ahead to anticipate some of these grim prospects.

Finally, there will be a problem of how to evaluate the whole process. Ideally we would have a little package for you in my monograph on evaluation where you could turn to page 20 and say here's the check list. Well, as the person who edited it I waited as each of my authors sent in his contribution and, although I enjoyed every one of them and feel I've learned a great deal from them, none of them provided the magic means by which we can say a given state system is good or bad. Part of the problem is obvious. If you evaluate the product it's a question of whose taste or whose value system, and what I would want by way of a product might not be what you would want in terms of the relative emphasis on access, on quality, on diversity, and on the balance between autonomy and accountability. Each one of us might bring to those values a very different interpretation. So to evaluate the state system in terms of its products gets you right back into that old Latin phrase, *de gustibus non disputandum est*—in matters of taste, let there be no dispute. We'll just have to say we don't know yet any way to resolve that problem or subject of values.

In terms of the evaluating process, however, things are not quite so grim. There, as I tried to stress earlier, talking about the open planning process and its need for participation, we know that all units, whether they be the executive, legislative or statewide board, need to engage in more of an open process so that the public and the constituent elements will understand what's happening to them. I think Jerry Miller's essay in the Association for Institutional Research monograph* stressing the need to look at the impact on public policy making is very good. It doesn't matter how beautiful the structure is if it's not producing results in terms of public policy. I also think that Clark Kerr in a recent comment made a lot of sense—he felt that it would not be wise to try to counsel perfection to people that are looking at statewide structures; that really the changes that have occurred when state leaders have acted to modify a board's power or change its structure or change its leadership haven't come up with an ideal solution. We don't seem to have struck on any single pattern that is universally valid, and if there is one which is working *relatively* well, perhaps the thing to do is to stick with it and just make improvements at the margin.

**Evaluating Statewide Boards*, edited by Dr. Berdahl.

issues in higher education

130 Sixth Street N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Non-Profit Org.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
ATLANTA, GA.
Permit No. 404

ASSOCIATE DIREC TOR
ERIC/HIGHER EDUCATION
1 DUpONT CIR. STE. 630 A23885
WASHINGTON DC 20036

When requesting change of address, please enclose above label.